

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 108

CS 503 003

AUTHOR Schramm, Wilbur
 TITLE The Beginnings of Communication Study in the United States.
 PUB DATE May 80
 NOTE 29p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (30th, Acapulco, Mexico, May 18-23, 1980).
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Biographies; *Communications; *History; Research; Social Sciences; State of the Art Reviews
 IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research; Hovland (Carl); Lasswell (Harold D); Lazarsfeld (Paul); Lewin (Kurt)

ABSTRACT

The history of communication research in the United States is reviewed in this paper through an extensive look at the lives of four men who made significant contributions to the field: Harold Lasswell, Kurt Lewin, Paul Lazarsfeld, and Carl Hovland. The pattern of institute formation in the social sciences is briefly reviewed to explain the development of communication research as a professional career field. The paper concludes with the suggestion that communication study may be absorbed into a more broadly conceived science of human society in the future. (AEA)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

THE BEGINNINGS OF COMMUNICATION STUDY IN THE UNITED STATES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wilbur Schramm

Wilbur Schramm
The East-West Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Smithsonian Institution in Washington has recently installed two remarkable window-panoramas of Bab elh-Dhra, a Bronze Age village that flourished 5,000 years ago in Jordan, just east of the Dead Sea. For many centuries Bab elh-Dhra was a stopping place for the nomads who used that desert area, because the quality of its water was famous. Then, shortly before 3000 B.C., when agriculture was beginning to replace the nomadic way of life, some families moved into Bab elh-Dhra and established a village. That settlement existed for a thousand years and passed out of human history. But it left its marks behind it in artifacts and tombs; archaeologists dug them up and the Smithsonian reconstructed what the village had been.

I have begun by talking about Bab elh-Dhra because it can be seen as an allegory for the early history of communication study, not only in the United States but in other countries as well. For centuries, scholars have stopped to look at communication problems and then moved on, as travelers over the desert stopped at Bab elh-Dhra and then went on their way. Only recently have scholars moved into communication country to stay. Anyone who has studied community has had to pay some attention to communication. Systematic comment on communication goes back at least as far as Plato, Aristotle, and Confucius. In the United States it was a subject of philosophical and political

ED1911108

CS 583063

interest long before Charles Cooley made his penetrating analysis of the communication process in his 1909 book Social Organization. Cooley approached communication as a sociologist. Walter Lippmann wrote about it as a journalist and a student of public opinion; Sapir as an anthropologist; Whorf as a linguist; Pierce, Wiener, and Shannon because it is basic to cybernetics; Gross, Bohlen, and Beal as rural sociologists; Cantril, Newcomb, Bauer, Osgood, Cartwright, Festinger, and other psychologists because it is basic to social psychology; Berelson, Lerner, Inkeles, Klapper, the Langs, Katz, and others because it was basic to the sociological problems they wanted to study; Pool and Deutsch as political scientists; Boulding as a social-minded economist; Mott, Casey, Nafziger, and others as students of journalism; and so forth. For the most part these scholars merely "stopped by" to visit scientific communication study. For some of them, however, it was a major career activity. To take a few examples, both Ithiel de Sola Pool and Elihu Katz are more likely now to be identified as communication scholars than as political scientist or sociologist respectively. I don't know whether the current President of the ICA, Professor Rogers, prefers to be considered a communication scholar or a rural sociologist, which he was initially trained to be, but his career for more than a decade has been in the social application of communication research. The point is that many of the most productive of modern communication scholars have come to the field as "visitors," applying their own disciplinary methods to communication problems, then going on, many of them, to other problems in their own field. Only recently -- as in

Rab elh-Dhra -- have visitors begun to move in and establish permanent settlements in communication.

Four men, however, came from their own disciplines into communication study and made such enormous impacts on the study of communication that they have every right to be known as the fathers of the field in the United States. I refer, of course, to Lasswell, Lewin, Lazarsfeld, and Hovland.

These "fathers" of our field had strikingly similar career backgrounds. All of them had rich early experiences, went to excellent universities, and came into contact with great minds. Three of them had all or part of their academic training in Europe. All four were broadly interdisciplinary in their interests. Each was trained in another discipline and turned to communication study through the experience of confronting "real world" problems. All of them had deep influence on younger scholars who came to be leaders in the field. And all except one of them founded a research institute or program which attracted bright young people and able colleagues.

Lasswell

Harold Lasswell grew up in Illinois. His mother was a teacher, his father a preacher. Their house was full of books. His parents gave Harold a copy of Windelblad's History of Philosophy to read when he was barely in his teens. Friends of the family introduced him to John Dewey, with whom he had a serious talk. He entered the University of Chicago in 1918, at the age of 16. Those were Chicago's great years when he

could study with Anton Carlson the biologist, John Maurice Clark the economist, Charles E. Merriam the political scientist (who directed his dissertation), Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess the sociologists, and the philosopher George Herbert Mead. As a graduate student he shared an office with Robert Redfield the anthropologist and Louis Wirth the sociologist. He spent most of two years in Europe where he assisted in Bertrand Russell's (unsuccessful) campaign for a seat in Parliament, sat in seminars with John Maynard Keynes and G. Lowes Dickinson, and went to Theodore Reik, author of Listening with the Third Ear, both for instruction and to experience analysis. It was a rich background for a scholarly career.

Then he went back to Chicago in 1926 to teach. Leo Rosten was one of his early students there, and wrote for the Saturday Review in 1967 a hilariously funny account of Lasswell as an ill-at-ease young teacher. I would read it to you if we had time, and heartily recommend it to you for your own reading. "He did not lecture so much as smother," says Rosten. "He lectured us desperately, with a glazed stare into outer space.... He talked so fast, so frantically, tumbling idea upon idea in a torrent of excitement, that his nonstop monologues became a polysyllabic blur." When Rosten got up courage to go to Lasswell's office and admit that he did not always entirely understand what the teacher was talking about, Lasswell fixed him with a clinical stare and said icily, "Communication is but the fortuitous parallelism of bio-psychic variables." "It took me years," Rosten added, "to discover why this phenomenally

- 5 -

intelligent, prodigiously articulate man resorts to such lingo...(I finally realized that) some men use language clumsily to conceal their complex feelings; Lasswell uses words brilliantly to conceal simple feelings and express complex ideas." Yet when Rosten looked back on his experience with Lasswell he concluded that he "learned more or was encouraged and jolted and inspired to learn more from him than from anyone I ever met." (Saturday Review, 1967, 55, pp. 65 ff.)

My own experiences with Harold were somewhat different from Leo's. I went to see him first when I was a young scholar and he was at the Center for Advanced Study. He put aside an enormous pile of manuscript and talked to me for four hours, incidentally forgetting dinner. I had no sense of being "snowed" -- rather of having met a fundamentally shy man who was deeply interested in what I was thinking and doing, and drew those things out of me so that he could set them against a fabulously wide intellectual background, and thus illuminate the problems both for him and for me. Throughout his career I found him always accessible, always helpful, always stimulating.

How was he helpful and stimulating? His chief contribution was not to substance but rather to a way of looking at communication study: a non-simplistic way. He sought always to get at the reality behind tables. He was more concerned with hypothesis-making than hypothesis-testing. He always emphasized the study of elites and leadership. And he was always interested in looking at probable futures and future options. It was our good fortune that from 1926 until 1978 he could pass along this

viewpoint to some of the brightest young men in the field of communication.

He was always in communication, or he was never in it: you can decide which. He called himself a political scientist, talked like one, thought like one. Yet he wrote his doctoral dissertation which, with the change of hardly a word, became his first book, on Propaganda in World War I, and he was always working on some real-world communication problem. He pioneered in content analysis even while he was a young teacher at Chicago. His most direct influence on future communication scholars, of course, was at Chicago. This was during the time when Robert Maynard Hutchins was the University President, and Hutchins refused to give Lasswell a permanency because -- so it was said -- he (Hutchins) simply could not stand social science. And Lasswell was not even an orthodox, respectable, single-discipline social scientist. He was a political sociologist, a political philosopher, a political psychologist, a political psychiatrist (who for a time practiced as a lay analyst), and, needless to say, a student of political communication. Hutchins was not impressed. When Lasswell decided in 1938 that his future at Chicago was hopeless, he resigned, packed all his books and notes into a truck, and started for New York. The truck burned up, with everything in it. He was without a job, without students, without the materials any scholar needs.

When he finally got his professorship, more than ten years later, it was at the Yale Law School, where he could direct no

dissertations, teach no social science graduate students. But if he had done no more than stimulate the graduate students he had during those twelve years at Chicago, he would have left an enduring monument behind him. His students included Herbert Simon, the most recent Nobel laureate in economics; V.O. Key, of Cornell; David Truman, of Columbia; Ithiel de Sola Pool, of M.I.T.; Morris Janowitz, of Chicago; Heinz Eulau and Gabriel Almond, until recently at Stanford; Barrington Moore, Abraham Kaplan, and many others you would recognize.

On them he had direct influence; thereafter he had to exert his influence through friendship, collaboration, and his unbelievably voluminous writing. He was responsible for between four and six million words of scholarly prose, depending on how one counts the editing and the collaboration. After he left Chicago with his academic career, his books and notes all in ashes, he was pushed into temporary assignments for a long time. Many of these were communication tasks. He headed the Library of Congress study of foreign propaganda during World War II. Two of his assistants there were Nathan Leites and Heinz Eulau. He headed the Stanford Hoover Institution study of propaganda symbols used by elites and by the prestige press. Two of his assistants there were Ithiel Pool and Daniel Lerner. In 1947 he wrote for Lyman Bryson's lecture series the paper every communication student reads, "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society." He remained active and productive until the week he died. Characteristically,

when he died, three huge volumes on Propaganda and Communication in World History were starting through the press.

From his 78 years with communication study he left a message for communication scholars and students which I am going to read to you:

There is a distinction (he said) between the exercise of a skill, and the coupling of skill with knowledge of the aggregate process to which the skill is ultimately related. Consider the difference between the businessman and the economist. Economists are properly considered professional because they have a verifiable image of the production, distribution, investment, and consumption of wealth. Physicians belong to the professional category because they are supposedly guided by a cognitive map of the individual and collective process of health and disease.

It is not enough for communication specialists to acquire skill in surveying, content analysis, or other technical operations. A genuine profession can be said to complement skill with enlightenment. In the case of communication, the conditions and projection of the entire process. It also implies the capacity to invent and evaluate policies for the accomplishment of postulated goals.

Lewin

In comparing Kurt Lewin with Lasswell keep in mind their life dates. Lewin was born in 1890, 11 years before Lasswell, 12 before Lazarsfeld, 20 before Hovland. He died in 1947, years before any of the others.

Furthermore, he was born in Germany, took his doctorate there, and had a considerable academic career before coming to the United States. He took the doctorate at the University of Berlin, when Wilhelm Wundt was head of the psychology

laboratory at that university. Greater influences on him, however, were Koffka, Kohler, and Wertheimer, who came to be called Gestaltists. They were attractive to young Lewin because they worked not with psychophysics, like Wundt, but with "questions of the soul" -- emotions, human relations, the formation of ideas and attitudes. Young Dr. Lewin fought in World War I, and came out with an Iron Cross although he seemed to us who knew him later a most unlikely soldier. He went back to teach at Berlin, built a distinguished academic career there, came to America and built another distinguished career at the University of Iowa, and was just starting a third career at M.I.T. when death overtook him.

In each of those places he influenced some of the best young social psychologists in the world: Vera Mahler, Tamaro Dembo, and some pioneers in Russian psychology while he was in Germany; Bavelas, Festinger, Schachter, White, Lippit, MacKinnon, Maier, and many others at Iowa; Kelley, Deutsch, Thibaut, Benne at M.I.T. What he was able to communicate to them was his own excitement in trying to understand and explain every bit of human behavior around him, and his insistence on being able to see the whole picture before trying to explain any part of it. If Lasswell was shy, Lewin was humble. If Lasswell was intense, Lewin was exciting. If Lasswell overwhelmed students by his knowledge, Lewin encouraged his students to join in his own drive to learn.

I remember him, his thin face flushed with excitement, eyes shining behind his glasses, pacing back and forth in

front of the chalkboard, arms flailing, asking, constantly challenging us: "Vot haf ve vergassen?"

There was no question I heard him ask more frequently. He was always thinking about the life space that entered into behavior, always trying to understand the whole field before trying to explain what happened within it.

Sometimes he said vergotten, sometimes vergassen. His language was never completely English or completely German. It didn't matter. His enthusiasm carried us along with him, although the fractured English gave his students many chuckles. In fact, what he said in rising politely to dispute a seminar speaker became a kind of password by which one aficionado of Lewin could recognize another. Lewin said politely, "can be, but I sink absolute ozzer." His followers chuckled to themselves and used the same phrase over and over.

He was not a great lecturer. He picked a problem to talk about and created as he spoke, sometimes stopping in mid-sentence to think out a point. His most effective teaching was his Saturday morning meetings open to all his students. In Berlin they were called the Quasselstrippe: Quassel means to ramble on; strippe is a string. In Iowa they were called the Hot Air Club and met, during the depression years when I knew him, in the top-floor room of a restaurant where a kindly proprietor let students bring their own lunches if they would just buy tea or coffee. They brought their lunches because the meetings sometimes lasted all day -- until Lewin would look at his watch and express mock regret for keeping them so long.

I remember students sitting on the floor with pencils in four colors and topological diagrams to sketch out field theory, every idea being challenged, everyone having a chance to speak his mind. "The most stimulating experience I have ever had," Norman Maier of Michigan said. "Historical approaches to psychological problems were swept aside. It seemed as if all questions were being attacked from scratch." "I could hardly wait for the meetings," said one of his German students, "and then I could hardly wait to run out of the meeting and do an experiment." "The group around Lewin," said Donald MacKinnon, "were as loyal as the group around Freud. Freud required absolute loyalty and conformity to his views. As a result the inevitable apostasies against Freud were very messy, whereas people would move out of Lewin's immediate circle and still maintain ties with him and others in his circle. If you drifted away you wouldn't feel guilty about it.

Out of meetings like these came the studies of the Zeigarnik effect and the analyses of anger as behavior, in Berlin; the Iowa studies of the effect of frustration on child development, and the remarkable wartime "food studies"; the Lippit-White study of democratic vs. authoritarian groups; the studies of group relations in factories that resulted in formation of the National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine. Lewin would never tell anyone that he had a theoretical system. He found field theory a good basis for his concept of the life space, and topology a good way to express his psycho-logic, but he never conceptualized a theoretical relationship and looked for

data to fit it. Tamaro Dembo, who was his student both in Germany and the United States, said that if someone asked him, how can you do this topologically, he would always answer, "Let's first look at the problem, and see what is possible. What's the problem?"

Yet he and his students were responsible for important theory. They were almost solely responsible for putting the group into communication theory and psychological research. They were responsible for the idea of the gatekeeper, which has become so important in communication study. They were responsible for what has come to be called consistency theory, and is represented by Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Heider's balance theory, Newcomb's A-B-X model, Osgood and Tannenbaum's congruity theory, McGuire and others' consistency theory, and even Hovland's 1960 volume. They were responsible for beginning the studies which have come to be called Group Dynamics.

He might have done more. He had barely two years at M.I.T. before he died, and after that his Group Dynamics Center moved to Michigan and helped to build the distinction of the Social Research Center. Some of Lewin's best students went with it, but it was not quite the same without the master.

It is amazing to think how much Lewin did in only 14 years in the United States, after he came in 1933, fleeing from virulent Naziism in Germany. Two years on a foundation fellowship at Cornell; ten years at what seemed at first a most unlikely place -- the Child Welfare Research Station, at Iowa; two years at M.I.T.

Yet we can hardly work in communication today without walking at some point in Kurt Lewin's footsteps. We have the same experience in applying communication to social change. Perhaps the best example I can give is what P.V. Krishnamoorthy said to me when I visited his Farm Forum pilot study in India. They were using group discussion, group decision, group commitment to put radio broadcasts into practical use for social change. "A man named Lewin found this out," Krishnamoorthy said to me, there, ten thousand miles from Iowa.

Lazarsfeld

Both Kurt Lewin and Paul Lazarsfeld were unintended gifts of Adolf Hitler to the American academic community. Lewin came at the age of 43 when anti-semiticism made his life and career impossible in Germany. Lazarsfeld came at age 32 when the shadow of Naziism across the border began to fall ever more heavily on Austria.

He had been born in Vienna in 1901, took a doctorate in mathematics at the University of Vienna, and in 1927 started a small institute for community studies. Influenced by Freud, he wanted to study the sources of behavior. Freud had been a major influence on Lewin also, and even on Lasswell who, when he was still a young scholar wet behind the ears, had the temerity to offer a series of public lectures trying to reconcile Freud and Marx. Lazarsfeld became deeply interested in psychological questions, and his chief scholarly product before he came to America was a book on The Unemployed of Marienthal,

an Austrian town where everyone was unemployed. So he learned about studying behavior and about survey research, and then was swept into the main current of American communication research by three extraordinary pieces of good fortune.

In the first place, the Rockefeller Foundation offered him a traveling fellowship to observe social research in the United States. He came, a specialist in community study trained in mathematics. While he was here the Foundation decided to establish an Office of Radio Research at Princeton, and offered him the directorship. That was the second fortunate event. Third, in that position he met Frank Stanton, who was then Director of Research and later became President of CBS, and learned from him of the research opportunities and the financial support available in radio audience research. With Stanton's support he moved to New York in 1935, and founded the Bureau of Applied Social Research, affiliated with Columbia and supported largely by foundation and commercial network funds. From a tiny institute in Vienna set up to make community studies and about to be swept away by the Nazi invasion, to the directorship of the best known research organization of its kind in the world at that time: two years and three pieces of luck!

Paul was no ordinary audience researcher. He was never much interested in how many were listening; rather in who was listening, what they listened to and why, and how they used what they heard. Gradually his interest, and that of the Bureau, turned from the audiences to the effects of radio, and this broadened to include the effects of film, television, printed media, and personal communication.

What kind of director, what kind of person, was Paul? Hearty, humorous, warm, exuding energy and vitality, full of ideas for research to be done and suggestions for how to do it, a great entrepreneur who could always find the money and the people for a worthwhile study. "What made Paul unique," said James Coleman, after Lazarsfeld died in 1976, "was not his involvement with ideas or his involvement with people but his ability to stir the two together." Like the other "fathers" of our field, he was a great stirrer, a great catalyst of important research. In the Bureau he had a place to bring people and catalyze research. He could bring together Robert Merton, who was already one of the leading sociologists in the United States; Leo Lowenthal and Rudolph Arnheim who had studied in Europe; Bernard Berelson, who had studied at Chicago, and James Coleman from the Hopkins; top level doctoral candidates and post-doctors like Elihu Katz, David Sills, Charles Glock, Herta Herzog. Paul influenced them in different ways -- some, like Katz, as teacher and research supervisor; others, like Merton, by providing funds for field research and a stimulating place to work; still others, like Herzog and Coleman and Klapper, by providing a place where they could exercise all their creativity and interact with others as creative as they.

Money for research and resources for field work were easy and quick at the Bureau; planning was smooth; interpretation and writing often took years. But the publications that gradually came out of the Bureau quickly set a new standard for audience research and studies of media influence. Of the four

"fathers" of the field, Paul was the one closest to the media, and did the most work on their function and structure.

"Paul was always fascinated with the study of what people liked and what they didn't like," Frank Stanton recalled. And so he and CBS built Big Annie, a program analyzer that automatically tallied which buttons people in a studio audience pushed to indicate whether they were or were not liking a program. That was a long step into formative research, 20 years before it became fashionable. Two volumes, respectively entitled Radio Research and Communication Research, in the 40's, carried some of the best known of the Bureau's papers, including Herzog on "What Do We Really Know about Daytime Serial Listeners" and Kendall's "The Children Talk about Comics," Berelson's "What Missing the Newspaper Means," and the Mr. Biggott study. With the help of the Bureau, Merton studied Kate Smith's all-day radio program that sold such a phenomenal amount of war bonds. Why did people buy, he asked, and through sampling and intensive interviews he found out. The resulting book was entitled Mass Persuasion. The nature of influence through the media and through personal contact began to loom larger in the Bureau's programs. Two large studies of Presidential elections were made in the 40's. One of these was of Erie County, Ohio, in 1940, the second of Elmira, New York, in the 1944 election. The report of the first study was called Voting, and appeared in 1944, just as the second study went into the field. Lazarsfeld was the chief author. The second did not come out until 1954, and Berelson was chief author. (Interpretation

seemed to grow harder and harder, take longer and longer, at the Bureau.) Both these books, however, concluded that the influence of the media may have been greatly exaggerated in the past. Very few people seemed to change their minds or their vote because of something in the media; much more effective were social background and personal influence.

Klapper summed this up in his book The Effects of Mass Communication, and in a different way Katz did so also in Personal Influence, of which Lazarsfeld was co-author. Both concluded that the chief effect of the mass media was social reinforcement: the media were used to confirm what people already believed or planned to do. Mass media ordinarily do not serve as a necessary and sufficient cause of audience effects. They operate through mediating factors and influences. Personal contacts and relationships are much more potent. One way the media may operate is through effect on influentials who in turn affect other people. This is the famous two-step flow hypothesis, which has now been generally discarded because it has been found to be too simple, but represents where Lazarsfeld and his colleagues had come out after 20 years of study: that in society the media are unlikely to have many direct effects; they work through something else, or are used to confirm or support ideas previously held.

Whether one accepts this point of view or not is less important than the fact that for more than two decades, under Lazarsfeld, the Bureau of Applied Social Research was the liveliest center of media research in the United States, and

probably in the world. And then Paul decided to withdraw from communication research and go back to studying mathematics, and teaching and administering sociology. Why did he leave the field for which he had done so much? It is hard to believe that the Bureau challenged him as much in 1955 as in 1935. Then it was the only organization of its kind, and was cutting a new trail. In 1955 it was no longer alone, and its problems were no longer so new. And perhaps Paul was simply tired, as he once said to me, and did not look forward to doing the same thing over and over. But when he passed out of the field, one of the great forces in communication study had gone.

Hovland

Thinking back over the four men we have been discussing, I have to say that Carl Hovland is the only one of the four whom we would not describe as "spectacular" -- except in his accomplishments, of course. The first three were spectacular even in their eccentricities. But if you were to put one of Charles Osgood's semantic differential scales in front of me, and ask me to evaluate Hovland, I should check quiet-noisy far over toward the quiet side. I would rate him calm, friendly, kind, helpful, whimsical. High ratings would go to adjectives like sharp, bright, systematic, careful. Not funny, eloquent, fiery, effervescent, dramatic. I would have a hard time with adjectives like exciting. It was certainly exciting to work along with Carl as he designed research, and yet he was always calm and quiet about it. Salesman? Entrepreneur? I could never think

of him as an entrepreneur and yet he never had trouble raising money for the large research program at Yale.

He was unlike the other three in other ways also. For one thing, he never studied in Europe. He was born in Chicago (in 1922), went to Northwestern, took his doctorate at Yale where he spent most of his career. At Yale he became Clark Hull's research assistant, and then Hull's co-investigator. He was not so obviously interdisciplinary as the others. Most of his principal teachers and close colleagues at Yale were psychologists -- Hull, Don Marquis, Spence, Hilgard, John Dollard, Neil Miller, Mowrer, Doob, Sears, and John Whiting. In the Yale Institute of Human Relations, however, he rubbed elbows with a number of distinguished visiting professors: Sapir, the anthropologist from Chicago; Robert Yerkes, who left for a time his study of primates in Florida to be at Yale; Walter Miles; Dusser de Barenne, from France, and others. But he made no such dramatic change of fields as Lazarsfeld -- from mathematics to community studies to media research. He was trained to be a psychologist and continued to be one.

He did make a mid-career change, however. In 1941, when he was not quite 30, he was already one of the outstanding experimental psychologists in America. He had published a series of penetrating papers on the generalization of conditioned response. He had been first author of Yale's important book on the Mathematico-Deductive Theory of Rote Learning. He had no small part in the 1939 study of Frustration and Aggression. All that by 1941. In 1942, with the United States at war,

he found himself Chief Psychologist and Director of Experimental Studies for the research branch of the War Department, in the information and education division. That title meant that he was to help Sam Stouffer plan a series of studies on the nature and causes of morale that provided much of the data for the later volumes on The American Soldier. His own specific assignment was to study the effectiveness of a series of Army orientation films entitled "Why We Fight."

Thus Hovland found himself, doubtless somewhat to his surprise, in communication research. It was very different from the rat laboratory and the studies of learning theory at Yale. Yet it was a research opportunity that he could hardly fail to recognize, and most of us could hardly dream about. He was assigned to study human behavior that had never before been studied very systematically. He was in charge of a research program that, within reason, could get as much research money as it needed. He could move out of the laboratory into the field whenever he wished, and still control experimental conditions. He could use very large samples of human subjects on whom much data were already available, and didn't even have to recruit them: the Army would command them. Thus it was that in 1941 he was an experimental psychologist working on learning theory, and in 1942 an experimental social psychologist working on human learning and attitude formation from the media.

One of the first things he did was to recruit a group of able graduate students to work in the new laboratory. Among

these were Irving Janis who later became head at Yale, Arthur A. Lumsdaine who became head at Washington, Fred D. Sheffield who became a professor at Yale, Nathan Maccoby who was then a student at Michigan and later succeeded me as head of the Institute at Stanford, and M. Brewster Smith, who is the immediate past president of the American Psychological Association. Quite a group.

The Army was not interested in building systematic theory for human communication; it needed practical guidance on its persuasive and instructional materials, and its policies in relation to morale. But no researcher could fail to see the theoretical implications. Hovland therefore continued in the same careful way he had designed experimental research at Yale, testing one variable and then another and then different combinations. He was able to give the Army useful advice. One of the early things he did was to find that the actual effect of a one-sided vs. a two-sided presentation was exactly contrary to one of the basic doctrines of Nazi propaganda. Goebbels said that to be successful a persuasive communication should not mention any counter-arguments, but simply say over and over again its own argument, with emotional appeals. Not so, said Hovland: for many persons a two-sided presentation was preferable -- for example, with persons initially hostile to the point of view or persons who would probably be exposed to the other side of the argument, and with better-educated persons. He was able to tell the Army, among other things, that for most of its soldiers it was more effective to say directly what

it wanted learned than to teach by implication. In ways like this, he was immensely useful to the Army's orientation and education program during the war years, and when the war was over he and Sam Stouffer loaded their IBM cards and questionnaire sheets into a truck and took them to Harvard, where Stouffer became Chairman of the Laboratory of Social Relations, and to Yale where Hovland became Chairman of Psychology, Sterling Professor, and founder of the Yale Program of Research on Communication and Attitude Change.

He took Janis, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield back to Yale with him. Around this nucleus gathered a remarkable group of graduate students whose names later appear on important research and in leading departments: Kelman, Harold Kelley, McGuire, Rosenberg, Abelson, Mandell, Weiss, A.R. Cohen, Lesser, and Morriset. You will recognize Gerry Lesser as the intellectual parent of Sesame Street, and Lloyd Morriset as President of the Markle Foundation.

1946 through 1961 were his great years at Yale, working on communication problems in the spirit of an experimental psychologist, designing his research with great care, choosing the most promising variables and then examining their relations to each other. Of all communication research programs, this one was conducted with the least compromise of scientific standards. We have too little time to review the findings or the publications, but let me recall a few of the areas which the Yale program was able to illuminate: the nature of credibility, "innoculation" against propaganda, fear appeals,

group allegiance, the "sleeper effect," audience participation, order of presentation, the nature of persuasibility, cognitive reorganization and consistency theory. It is not well-known that Hovland also contributed in an important way, while all this other research was going on, to computer simulation in communication study.

What kind of program director was Carl? "The world's most non-authoritarian," his colleagues said. The kind of person you could call "Carl" with complete respect and without embarrassing either him or you. "An uncanny ability to integrate and focus knowledge, and discern the central aspects of a problem." Gentle and supportive but highly demanding of quality. Always quiet, always calm. Always encouraging his students to try out their own ideas -- but insisting on their planning the minutest details.

When he developed cancer in the late 1950s he changed none of his work habits, worked along calmly with his students and colleagues as long as the disease let him work, then went home, and quietly as he did everything else, ended his life.

The Development of Long-Term Programs

These four great men represent the great chapter in the history of communication research in the United States, but not the last chapter. Just as visitors were followed by settlers in the village of Bab elh-Dhra, so, beginning with the late 1940s and the 1950s, scholars began to create organizations where they could spend their careers in communication

study, rather than dropping in to study briefly a communication problem and returning to their main interest.

To understand what happened, it is helpful to review the pattern of institute formation in the social sciences. Lazarsfeld wrote a penetrating analysis of this process for the University of Colorado when it was planning to start its own social research institute. Institutes, laboratories, special programs, he said, have been one of the chief ways by which change has been brought to change-resistant higher education. The sixteenth century was the time when humanistic studies were integrated into universities, and perhaps the most characteristic institutional event was the founding of the College de France. The 17th century was the time when the natural sciences emerged in the curriculum, and for this the Royal Society of London was both leader and symbol. The 19th century brought about the modern integrated university, for which the German universities and chiefly the University of Berlin set the pattern. And the 20th century was the era when the social sciences came into the university, branching off from philosophy by means of a variety of centers, laboratories, institutes, and bureaus.

In the United States the process of institute formation for new kinds of social research began, before World War I, with community studies, conducted largely by social workers. In the early 30s a second type of institute appeared, originating in data rather than problems. Commercial consumer studies, public opinion polling, radio audience surveys all became

useful, and these studies, as Lazarsfeld said, were "the raw material for the new field of communication and opinion research." At that time a few institutes were created to conduct social research for its own sake, most typically the Bureau of Social Research at Columbia University, Lazarsfeld's own creation. After the war of 1939-45 there was a third wave of institute building, largely growing out of government use of empirical research. Examples of these new organizations were Hovland's Program for the Study of Communication and Attitude Change at Yale, Stouffer's Harvard Laboratory of Social Relations, and the Michigan Survey Research Center which had its roots in the Department of Agriculture and the Office of War Information. In the late 1940s and the 1950s there was still another wave of institute creation, when some universities felt the need to have organized social research, but wanted to build it close to their existing departments without setting up something new and separate. These universities looked for a director and a few key members, rather than entire staffs, and drew upon their own existing resources. This was the time when the University of Illinois started its Institute of Communication Research (in 1947), and Stanford its Institute for Communication Research (in 1955). These universities and most of the others who followed their lead tended to build communication institutes close to their existing programs in journalism, and sometimes broadcasting, film and speech, so that research would enrich the practical instruction in media, and proximity to media work would keep the research "honest."

An additional reason for keeping the research programs close to the practical programs was to provide high-quality graduate work for students in the media. As you are well aware, a high proportion of the research on mass communication in the United States is now coming out of such places as I have mentioned, in addition to Wisconsin and Minnesota, where research programs began in journalism and expanded to communication research; very large schools of communication like Texas and Syracuse where formal research programs have been added as part of the experience available to advanced students; the Annenberg Schools of Communication at Pennsylvania and UCLA; and a number of other leading universities, too many to mention here.

I am not going to review the research record of this latest chapter in communication history, merely to point out that it is a new pattern and has proved to be a productive one. As the communication institutes and programs have begun to do more, the older institutes and programs have tended to pull back toward their own unique disciplinary origins. The Bureau of Applied Social Research is still in existence, but no longer specializes in communication studies. Hovland's Yale program is still in existence, but now concentrates more on psychology than on communication and attitude change. The Michigan Survey Research Center is still interested in communication but concentrates on its opinion and behavioral surveys.

The Next Chapter?

You will remember that the village of Bab elh-Dhra disappeared after a thousand years, despite all the advantages of its good water and its experience with settlement. Can we extend that parallel to the study of communication? In other words, are communication institutes and programs likely to become permanent components of university structure and social science activity, and build around themselves the disciplinary walls and boundaries that we see in the older social sciences.

I am going to give you an answer you may not like. Although the communication institutes and programs seem very healthy now, I should not be surprised if within a century or two they were absorbed into a new university structure combining the study of man and society. Communication is a fundamental process of every social science discipline; that is why visitors from these disciplines kept dropping into it for short or long periods. The communication programs have kept themselves interdisciplinary: their graduate programs are almost invariably so, and their staffs usually include at least a few scholars trained in psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, or economics. To take one example, the Communication Institute of the East-West Center includes scholars from all these disciplines, as well as scholars with degrees in communication.

What we are seeing now, therefore, is likely to be a phase which will confirm the importance of communication research and greatly enrich university training in the communication media, but is not necessarily permanent. As the social

disciplines abandon their exclusivity and build their theory on a broader base, I wonder whether we cannot expect communication research and communication study to be absorbed, along with social psychology, sociology, anthropology, and the others, into a more broadly conceived science of human society or, possibly, a science of man?